

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-25 were rejected. Claims 1, 10, 19 and 25 have been amended for clarification. New claim 26 has been added. Thus, claims 1-26 are pending and under consideration. No new matter has been added. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101:

On page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Independent claim 19 is hereby amended to recite, “a computer-implemented education system” via which a teaching material is presented to a user based on learning behavior of the user. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully assert that amended claim 19 is within the Examiner’s admitted category of statutory subject matter (see, pages 2 and 3 of the outstanding Office Action).

It is respectfully submitted that claim 19 satisfies the requirements of 35 USC § 101, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

Claims 1-23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over one or more of the following: U.S. Patent No. 5,810,605 (‘605), U.S. Patent No. 5,122,952 (‘952) and U.S. Patent No. 6,206,700 (‘700).

‘605 discusses presenting a material to a student based on a stored learning profile indicating the student’s capabilities for determining whether the student has mastered the presented material after the student has completed the material.

‘952 discusses selecting and matching learning tools that possess developmental value with individual characteristics of a child where questionnaires are collected and analyzed to generate a preferred products list.

‘700 discusses progressing a user through learning tasks where the user’s actions and responses in reaction to a stimuli are recorded and analyzed for classifying the user’s learning strategy.

The present application is directed to dynamically adjusting a presentation pattern presented to a student in accordance with real-time learning behavior of the student.

The Examiner maintains the comparison of the '605 system for presenting an educational program to a student in a manner compatible with the student's stored learning profile with the present invention. Accordingly to '605, profiles are generated and stored for use to select a material to be presented to a student during each session (see, column 3, lines 10-13, and column 3, lines 26-30 of '605). The profiles are periodically modified based upon assessment of the student's performance on the educational program (see, FIG. 2, abstract, and column 4, lines 5-7 of '605). Specifically, the '605 system assesses the student's mastery of the lesson presented (see, FIG. 2, column 4, lines 5-7, and column 9, lines 21-24 of '605) and based on the student's mastery of the given lesson, the subsequent presentation of the educational program is adjusted (see, column 4, lines 5-30 of '605). This means that the '605 system is limited to assessing a student's mastery of a presented education program and updating the way the educational program is subsequently presented to the user.

In '952, commercially available or specially designed products (i.e., toys, games, books, and allied learning materials) are evaluated and characterized on a standard product evaluation form (see, column 4, lines 1-11 and Table A of '952). Then, a questionnaire is presented to parents (or to a child) having questions concerning a personal static information related to the child and dynamic user developmental conditions, such as the child's cognitive, social, emotional, physical development, etc., (see, column 15, lines 30-37 and column 16, line 65 through column 17, line 4 of '952). The compiled data is used to perform a set of matching sequences where the characteristics of the child is matched with the characteristics of products (see, column 38, lines 53-57 of '952). This means that the '952 system is limited to analyzing responses to a questionnaire in relation to a child for selecting toys, games, books, etc..

In '700, stimuli for the programming including approximately 1600 words, sounds, pictures, which form the basis for the training lessons presented with system (see, column 7, lines 58 of '700). A software records and analyzes a response profile of the user for each lesson or lesson package, where codes are assigned to each answer with a value correlated to the meaning of the learning strategy of the user (see, column 9, lines 15-23 of '700). A performance profile is derived from the analyzed response profile of the user, which is compared to the performance criteria and imposed strategy, for evaluating the performance of the user to select a change in strategy or maintaining the same (see, column 9, lines 23-31 of '700). This means that the '700 system is directed to analyzing a user's performance by comparing standardized and preset goals or criteria based on right/wrong criteria and non-right/non-wrong criteria to adjust pre-selected plans (see, column 4, lines 3-15 of '700).

In contrast, the present invention dynamically adapts or adjusts a teaching material by providing “a questionnaire to a user and analyzing an answer to said questionnaire to determine a trait of said user related to personality” and determining “a teaching material presentation pattern for said user in accordance with said determined trait of said user” (claims 1, 10 and 19). The present invention also includes, “analyzing learning behavior of said user during a learning process” to customize the teaching material by “dynamically modifying said teaching material presentation pattern based on the trait and the learning behavior of said user” (see, claims 1, 10, 19, page 2, line 30-36, and page 4, line 33 through page 5, line 5 of the present application). This is unlike the ‘605 system that assesses the student’s progress after the student has been presented with the educational program, the ‘952 for selecting commercially available or specially designed products, and/or the ‘700 system for analyzing a user’s performance by comparing standardized and preset goals or criteria based on right/wrong criteria and non-right/non-wrong criteria to adjust pre-selected plans.

Further, independent claims 24 and 25 as amended recite, analyzing learning behavior of the user during a learning process such that the teaching materials (teaching material presentation pattern in claim 25)” are “dynamically modified” based on the trait and the learning behavior of the user.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over the combination of the cited references.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from independent claims 1, 10, 19, 24 and 25 are patentably distinguishable over the combination of the cited references. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 4, the teaching material presentation pattern based on a trait of a user “defines specific magnitudes related to difficulty, required time and dissimilarity of the teaching material elements”. The combination of the cited references does not teach or suggest, “dynamically modifying said teaching material presentation pattern based on the trait and the learning behavior of the user” (claim 1), where the teaching material presentation pattern based on a trait of a user “defines specific magnitudes related to difficulty, required time and dissimilarity of the teaching material elements” (claim 4).

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 26 has been added to highlight that the present invention includes, “analyzing

a learning behavior of the user based on a response to a questionnaire provided to the user", where "the response to the questionnaire [is] used to determine a trait of the user related to personality and a teaching material presentation pattern for the user". This enables the present invention to present "a teaching material to the user in accordance with the determined teaching material presentation pattern [that is] determined based on the trait of said user", where the method includes "further analyzing the learning behavior of the user during a learning process for dynamic modification of the teaching material presentation pattern and presenting the teaching material accordingly".

This enables a method of adaptively presenting a teaching material to a user by adjusting the teaching material "dynamically" and presenting an accurately tailored teaching material corresponding to each user.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Dec 30 2004

By: Mark J. Henry

Mark J. Henry
Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501